

## REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's withdrawal of the prior rejections.

Applicants are amending Claim 1 to eliminate one of two "a" at the beginning of the claim.

Applicants have the following response to the Examiner's sole (new) rejection in the Office Action.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-18 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Cok et al. (US 6,911,772). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, independent Claim 1 recites the features of "a first light-emitting element for emitting a red color comprising a transparent first electrode, a first layer including an organic compound and touching the first electrode, and a transparent second electrode touching the first layer including the organic compound" (emphasis added). Hence, both the first electrode and the second electrode are transparent electrodes.

The Examiner contends that Cok discloses first and second electrodes as reference numerals 30 and 18 in FIG. 3, respectively.<sup>1</sup> However, it appears that the "first electrodes 18" (the alleged second electrode of Claim 1) in Cok are not "transparent" electrodes. In particular, Cok states at col. 3, lines 44-47 that "Light that is emitted toward the substrate 12 is reflected from the first electrodes 18 and passes through the light emitters and the filter layer 40 and is emitted through the cover 36" (emphasis added). Hence, Cok does not disclose or suggest "a transparent second electrode", as claimed in independent Claim 1.

---

<sup>1</sup> Cok gives reference numerals 30 and 18 different names. In Cok, reference numeral 18 are "first electrodes" (see col. 2, line 49) and reference numeral 30 is a "second electrode" (see col. 2, line 61).

Similarly, regarding the claimed transparent fourth electrode and transparent sixth electrode, Cok does not appear to disclose or suggest “a transparent fourth electrode” or “a transparent sixth electrode” (emphasis added), as recited in independent Claim 1.

Similar to Claim 1, Cok also does not appear to disclose or suggest the claimed “a transparent second electrode” of independent Claims 2 and 13.

Therefore, Cok does not disclose or suggest the device of independent Claims 1, 2 and 13, and Claims 1, 2, and 13 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over Cok. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### New Claims

Applicants are also adding new dependent Claims 19-27. These claims are supported by, for example, page 7, line 21 to page 9, line 4 in the specification and Fig. 1 of the present application.

As these are dependent claims, they are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these new claims be entered and allowed.

If any fee should be due for these new claims, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

#### Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee should be due for this amendment and/or the new claims, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 27, 2007

/Mark J. Murphy/  
Mark J. Murphy  
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,  
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.  
200 West Adams Street; Suite 2850  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568